Attention should also be drawn to the new fields which the Narcotics Commission has begun to explore in recent years, by tackling the problem of drug addiction and the question of synthetic drugs. The problem of drug addiction is of course as old almost as humanity itself but not until recently have the preventive and curative aspects of this problem begun to receive, on the part of governments generally, the serious consideration which they merit. It is heartening to note that the Commission has requested the Secretariat to give relatively high priority to the study of this problem.

As for the developments in the field of the production and use of synthetic drugs, they represent a new, and in many waysa revolutionary problem in this field. The countries which produce what might be termed the "natural" narcotics are relatively few in number: and international machinery for the control of production and distribution of narcotics has in the past been geared to that fact. But now, with the development of these "synthetic" drugs, the number of countries which are potential producers is considerably enlarged. New techniques of international rationing, allocation and control must now be developed: and in that connection, existing machinery may have to be remodelled or overhauled. My government will continue to follow with interest the work that is being undertaken in this connection, leading to the establishment of a single Consolidated Convention replacing the nine which are now in existence, as well as the consolidation, rationalization and more effective co-ordination of the work of such bodies as the Narcotics Commission itself, the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Drug Supervisory Body.

May I turn now to Chapter V of the Council's Report and to the important questions dealt with there. Before dealing with the questions of the human rights covenants, the U.S. proposals, or the problem of freedom of information, I should first like to say a word about the position of the Human Rights Commission itself. Then have been a number of occasions in past years - and the present debate is another such occasion - when the Canadian Delegation has wished that both the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council would show a greater amount of consideration for the position of the Commission, and a greater amount of patience, tolerance and forbearance in regard to the progress of its work. Declarations of Human Rights for all mankind, and the convenants which are designed to give them substance and reality, cannot be drafted on the back of an envelope, or overnight. These things take time, and the final results when they emerge for the consideration of this Assembly will be all the better for the time and patient care that are lavished on them. Humanity has gone for thousands of years without capturing in words or legal formulations which can be binding on governments, all of the manifold aspirations of mankind which we are now seeking to embody in the Human Rights covenants. Can we not contain ourselves in patience just a little longer, and give to the Commission the time and unhurried calm needed to finish in orderly fashion the job handed to them back in 1945 and 1946? True, the Commission has now been at work on these covenants for several years. Is that too long a time to take in formulating what may come to be regarded as the Magna Carta for future generations of mankind, throughout the world? Yet throughout the last few years both the Assembly and Council